

**Re.** : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
**Appl. No.** : 10/728,284  
**Filed** : December 4, 2003

## **II. REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-24 were previously pending and the Office Action rejected Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-24. By the foregoing amendments, Applicants amended Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9 and 21 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and cancelled Claims 3, 4, 5, 15-20 and 23-24 to further clarify, more clearly define, broaden the claimed invention and/or expedite receiving a notice of allowance or, in the alternative, to place the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(f), no new matter is introduced by these amendments. Applicants believe that Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11-14 and 21-22 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Please note that Applicants' remarks are presented in the order in which the issues were raised in the Office Action for the convenience and reference of the Examiner. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants' discussion and understanding of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's. Further, the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any particular reference and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and that reference.

### **Response to the Section 112 Rejection**

The Office Action rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The office Action stated the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

**Re.** : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
**Appl. No.** : 10/728,284  
**Filed** : December 4, 2003

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Office Action contends that the body of the first connecting member is not originally disclosed to have a hollow interior portion formed during the blow-molding process.

Applicants respectfully traverse this Section 112 rejection because the claims fully satisfy and comply with the written description requirement. However, in order to place the application in condition for immediate allowance, Applicant cancelled Claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants request that this Section 112 rejection be withdrawn.

#### Response to the First Section 102(e) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233967 to Lin. The Office Action states in the embodiment in Figures 1 and 2, the Lin publication teaches a table with a table top (1). The Office Action also states the following: the table top (1) has a top surface and a bottom surface; a frame structure (2) made of metal; a mounting structure (12) centrally disposed on the bottom surface; the mounting structure (12) including a first connecting member (A') and a second connecting member (B'); a first and second leg assembly (23, 24) attached to the table top; a first support assembly (25) attached to the first leg assembly (23, 24) and to a first connecting rod (G'); the first connecting rod (G') is connected to the first and second connecting member (A', B') and second connecting rod (H') is also connected to the first and second connecting member (A', B'); a second leg assembly (23, 24) has a second support assembly (25) connected to the second connecting rod (H'); a first handle (E') is attached to the inner side of

**Re.** : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
**Appl. No.** : 10/728,284  
**Filed** : December 4, 2003

the first connecting member (A') and the first connecting member has a c-shape with the middle space (14) allowing for a person to place their fingers around the handle (E'); the handle (E') is considered spaced apart from the connecting rods (26) since the handle (E') is only received by a person's hand at the space (14) and the ends of the c-shaped first connecting member (A') act to space apart the handle (E') from the connecting rod (26); the handle (E') is formed discretely or from a separate piece than the first connecting member (A'); and a second handle (F') is attached to the inner side of the second connecting member (B') and disposed between the first and second connecting rod (26).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection at least because the Lin publication fails to disclose each and every limitation of Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12-14. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, to further clarify, more clearly define and/or broaden the claimed invention, expedite receiving a notice of allowance and/or place the claims in better condition for appeal, Applicants amended Claims 1 and 21.

For example, Applicants amended Claim 1 to provide "a first bracket connected to the inner side of the first connecting member; a first connecting rod connected to the first bracket and the first connecting member." Applicants also amended Claim 1 to provide "a handle attached to the first bracket, the handle being a separate and discrete structure than the first bracket and the first connecting member, the handle being spaced apart from the first connecting rod." Thus, Claim 1 now positively recites the first bracket is connected to the inner side of the first connecting member and the first connecting rod is connected to the first bracket and the first connecting member. In addition, Claim 1 now positively recites the handle is attached to the first bracket, the handle is a separate and discrete structure than the first

Re. : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
Appl. No. : 10/728,284  
Filed : December 4, 2003

bracket and the first connecting member, and the handle is spaced apart from the first connecting rod.

In contrast, the Lin publication does not disclose a first bracket connected to the inner side of the first connecting member or a first connecting rod connected to the first bracket and the first connecting member. In addition, the Lin publication does not disclose a handle attached to the first bracket, a handle that is a separate and discrete structure than the first bracket and the first connecting member, and a handle is spaced apart from the first connecting rod.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and request that this rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 6, 7, 9 and 11-14, which are dependent on Claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this Section 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

#### Response to the Second Section 102(e) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-17 and 21-23 under Section 102(e) as being unpatentable over the Lin publication.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Applicants amended Claims 1 and 21 in view of the Lin publication and Claims 1 and 21 are now allowable in view of the Lin publication. Thus, Applicants request that this Section 102(e) rejection be withdrawn. In addition, at least because Claims 2, 6, 12-14 and 22 are dependent upon amended Claims 1 and 21, respectively, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Consequently, Applicants request that this Section 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

**Re.** : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
**Appl. No.** : 10/728,284  
**Filed** : December 4, 2003

Response to the First Section 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lin publication. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every limitation of Claim 11. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Applicants amended Claim 1 in view of the Lin publication. Consequently, Applicants submit that Claim 11, which depends from independent Claim 1, is allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants request that this Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Response to the Second Section 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected Claims 3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lin publication. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference fails to teach, suggest or disclose each and every limitation of Claims 3 and 11. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Applicants amended Claim 1 in view of the Lin publication. Consequently, Applicants submit that Claims 3 and 11, which depend from independent Claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons and request that this Section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11-14 and 21-22 are allowable over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request that a Notice of Allowance be promptly issued.


**Re.** : Amendment and Response to Final Office Action Mailed March 28, 2006  
**Appl. No.** : 10/728,284  
**Filed** : December 4, 2003

If any further impediments to allowance of this application remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned by telephone so that these remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, which have not otherwise been paid, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178. If any additional extension of time is required, which have not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 28, 2006

By:   
Richard C. Gilmore  
Registration No. 37,335  
Attorney of Record

**Customer No. 22,913**

WORKMAN NYDEGGER  
1000 Eagle Gate Tower  
60 East South Temple  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 533-9800  
Facsimile: (801) 328-1707  
E-mail: [rgilmore@wnlaw.com](mailto:rgilmore@wnlaw.com)